UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/944,784	08/30/2001	Jamal Ghani	R272-001.2	1825

31955   7590   03/09/2005

CAPSTONE LAW GROUP LLP
1810 GATEWAY DRIVE
SUITE 260
SAN MATEO, CA 94404

EXAMINER
KE, PENG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12/7/04*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
   closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-14* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-14* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
      application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 5-8, and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Dunlap et al. US 6,560,637 in view of Silverbrook et al. US 2003/0120998.

As per claim 1, Dunlap teaches an electronic system for facilitating communication

between a presenter and a plurality of participants over a communication network comprising:

a presenter computer having a presenter graphical user interface to control the display of

a presentation; (col. 5, lines 25-45)

a plurality of participant computers each having a presenter graphical user interface for

viewing the presentation, requesting permission; (col. 6, lines 16-44)

a system server configured for brokering communication between the presenter computer

and the plurality of participant computers comprising:

a presentation conversion engine, wherein the presentation conversion engine converts

application specific presentation files to a universal image format file (col. 4, lines 20-35);

a web server application, wherein the web server application controls receipt of

commands from the presenter graphical user interface, push of controls to the participant

graphical user interfaces and storage of the universal image format file for transmission to the

participant graphical user interface; (col. 3 ,lines 23-34)

a database, wherein the application specific presentation file is stored in the database;

(col. 3 ,lines 35-53) and

graphical user interface controls the presentation on the participant graphical user

interface; (col. 6,lines 16-44)

a core engine for controlling communications and interactions between all of tile other

applications on the system server as well as communication with the presenter computer and the

participant computers. (col. 3, lines 35-53)

However, Dunlap fail to teach allowing presenter to authorize participants to pose a

questioning in respond to a posed question

generating a whiteboard application, wherein the whiteboard application responses to

commands generated by the presenter.

Silverbrook et al. teaches allowing presenter to authorize participants to pose a question

in respond to a posed question. (figure 9, paragraph 0119, 0133; Examiner interpret inviting

specific participants to be allowing specific participants to pose question because only the invited

participants can post question. Furthermore, since only people with authorized access can post

messages, a chairperson may permit an observer to post a message by changing his access level.)

generating a whiteboard application, wherein the whiteboard application responses to

commands generated by the presenter. (paragraph 144)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include

Silverbrooks' teaching with method of Dunlap in order to provide users with a discussion board

during the presentation.

As per claim 5, Dunlap and Silverbrook teach the system recited in claim 1. Silverbrook

further teaches wherein the whiteboard application provides tools on the presenter graphical user

interface to create annotations on the presenter graphical user interface to be displayed on the

presentation viewed on the participant graphical user interface. (fig. 21, item "message"; The

texts that are displayed in the message area of the figure will be displayed in the participant's

graphical user interface)

As per claim 6, Dunlap and Silverbrook teach the system recited in claim 1. Silverbrook

teaches wherein the system server receives the annotations created on the presenter graphical

user interface and transmits the annotations to the participant graphical user interface. (fig. 21,

item "message"; The texts that are displayed in the message area of the figure will be displayed

in the participant's graphical user interface)

As per claim 7, Dunlap and Silverbrook teach the system recited in claim 1. Dunlap

wherein the whiteboard application converts the universal image format file to an image stream

and transmits the image stream to the participant computers. (col. 4, lines 20-35)

As per claim 8, it is rejected with the same rationale as claim 1. (Supra)

As per claims 12-14, they are of the same scope as claims 5-7. (Supra)

Claims 2-4 and 9-11are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Dunlap et al. US 6,560,637 in view of Silverbrook et al. US 2003/0120998.

As per claim 2, Dunlap and Silverbrook teach the system recited in claim 1. However,

they fail to teach the method wherein the media engine controls the delivery of audio and/or,

video media from the presenter computer to the plurality of participant computers by creating a

first IP tunnel from the presenter computer through the system server to the plurality of

participant computers.

Rueda et al. teaches a method wherein the media engine controls the delivery of audio

and/or, video media (paragraph 0006) from the presenter computer to the plurality of participant

computers by creating a first IP tunnel from the presenter computer through the system server to

the plurality of participant computers. (paragraph 0016)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Rueda's

teaching with method of Dunlap and Silverbrook in order to provide users with a ability to

transfer live video through a network to network IP protocols.

As per claim 3, Dunlap, Silverbrook, and Rueda teaches the system recited in claim 2.

Dunlap further teaches wherein upon an authorization request identifying an authorized

participant computer transmitted from the presenter computer to the system server (col. 5, lines

25-45). Ruede teaches media engine creates a second IP tunnel from the authorized participant

computer to tile presenter computer and the plurality of participant computers. (paragraph 0016)

As per claim 4, Dunlap, Silverbrook, and Rueda teaches the system recited in claim 2.

Ruede teaches the method wherein the media transmitted over the first IP tunnel is processed

only by media codes resident on the presenter computer and the plurality of participant

computers and is not processed by the system server. (paragraph 0016)

As per claims 9-11, it is of the same scope as claims 2-4. (Supra)

Response to Argument

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14 have been considered but are deemed

to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Contract Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Peng Ke whose telephone number is (571) 272-4062. The

examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and Alternate Fridays 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Kristine L Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Peng Ke